

Worksheet
Documentation of Land Use Plan Compliance
and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

DNA-NM-060-2002-026

A. BLM Office: Roswell Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No.:#65075

Proposed Action Title/Type: Bogle Vest Camp Mesquite Control

Location of Proposed Action: Portions of T.13 S. R.29 E., Sections 21,23,25,26,27,33,34,35,36

T. 13S. R 30E., Sections 19,20,21,28,29,30,31,32,33

T. 14S. R.29E., Sections 3,4,5

T. 14S. R 30E., Sections 3,4,5,6,7,8,9,and 10. (Map Attached)

Allotment #65077 (Turkey Track) is located approximately 40 miles southeast of Roswell New Mexico in Chaves County.

Description of Proposed Action:

The proposed action is to apply the liquid herbicide Reclaim and Remedy by aerial application to a total of 6,880 acres of mesquite in two pastures in subsequent years. The first year, approximately 2,880 acres of mesquite within the East Vest camp pasture would be chemically treated. The second phase would consist of treated approximately 4,000 acres of mesquite in the West Vest Camp pasture. Livestock would be removed from the treatment area and would be deferred from livestock for a minimum of two consecutive growing seasons and use would return depending upon vegetative response. The goal of the project is to improve the rangeland health condition by treated dense stands of mesquite within the grassland community. This project will help the adjacent shinnery oak dune community by improving forage conditions and reducing the amount of pressure that is put on the shinnery oak dune areas resulting in enhance habitat for the lesser prairie chicken.

Applicant (if any): BLM-RFO and Bogle Ltd.

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

LUP Name: Roswell RMP

Date Approved: October 1997

LUP Name:

Date Approved:

Other document Veg Treatment On BLM lands EIS

Date Approved July 1991

Other document

Date Approved

Other document

Date Approved

[choose one:]

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions) and, if applicable, implementation plan decisions:

C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the Proposed action.

[List by name and date]

Pearce Trust and Bogle Turkey Track Ranch Mesquite Control EA #NM-060-99-0120
Date Approved 9/20/99

[List by name and date other documents relevant to the proposed action (e.g., source drinking water assessments, biological assessments, biological opinion, watershed assessments, allotment evaluation, rangeland health standards assessment and determinations, and monitoring).]

New Mexico Standards and Guidelines for Rangeland Health - Date Approved 1/12/01

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?

Yes, several mesquite control projects in close proximity to the proposed action have been completed in the past two years. The plant community, soils and operations are for the most part the same. Refer to EA#NM-060-99-0120

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values and circumstances?

Yes, the approved EA's looked at alternatives as well as alternatives discussed in the Vegetation Treatment On BLM lands EIS.

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new

information or circumstances? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis on the proposed action?

Yes, there are no new issues or information and all actions, mitigation and affected resources are the same and have been analyzed in the past year.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

Yes, the NEPA process has been completed and the standard operating procedures will be adhered to.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

The direct and indirect impacts have not changed from those identified in the existing NEPA documents since the documentation is very recent and the proposed project area is the same. Site specific impacts are also the same in regards to the affected environment and resources.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from the implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Yes, the existing NEPA document was very thorough.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Yes, the public interest and entities have not changed and have reviewed the past documents with no protests or appeals.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet/

Rand French - Wildlife Biologist - Wildlife, T/E

Helen Miller - Rangeland Mgt. Specialist - Range, Noxious Weeds

Mike Bilbo - Outdoor Recreation Planner - Recreation, Cave/karst

F. Mitigation Measure: [rather list all mitigation measures in LUPs and other documents as directed (why rewrite the EA), refer to the documents by name and number in this place.]

Vegetation management and criteria for control is discussed on page 33 and 35 and Mitigation measures and standard operating procedures are listed in the Roswell RMP appendix 9.

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action. This constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirement of NEPA.

[If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made.]

/s/ T. R. Kreager
Assistant Field Manager - Resources

2/7/02
Date